IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 3:23-CR-98-RAH
)	
PAMELA DENISE WILLIAMS)	

ORDER

On January 18, 2024, this Court sentenced Defendant Pamela Denise Williams to 33 months of imprisonment followed by 5 years of supervised release on her conviction for bank fraud. (Doc. 47.) Since her sentencing, the Defendant has filed three Motions for Sentence Reduction pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) and Amendment 821 to the Federal Sentencing Guidelines. (Docs. 52, 56, 61.) She filed the motions *pro se*.

On June 5, 2024, this Court denied the Defendant's first motion, specifically finding:

The defendant received no Chapter Four status points at her original sentencing and was not determined to be a zero-point offender. Pursuant to USSG §1B1.10(a)(2)(A), a reduction in the defendant's term of imprisonment is not consistent with this policy statement and therefore is not authorized under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) because none of the amendments listed in subsection (d) is applicable to the defendant.

(Doc. 54 at 1.)

On August 5, 2024, this Court denied the Defendant's second motion, specifically finding:

On June 5, 2024, the Court denied the defendant's motion for a sentence reduction pursuant to Amendment 821. The defendant did not receive status points and is not a zero-point offender and therefore is ineligible for relief under Parts A and B of Amendment 821. The issues presented in the defendant's second pro se motion (doc. 56) were considered by the Court when it concluded that the defendant was ineligible for a sentence reduction. To the extent that the defendant's second pro se motion seeks reconsideration of the Court's June 5, 2024 Order, the motion presents no new grounds for relief and is denied.

(Doc. 59 at 1.)

Pending before the Court is the Defendant's third motion, in which she seeks an adjustment for zero-point offenders based on §4C1.1 of the Sentencing Guidelines. (Doc. 61.) As explained in this Court's prior orders (Docs. 54, 59), Amendment 821 is inapplicable because the Defendant did not receive status points and is not a zero-point offender.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the third Motion for Reduction of Sentence pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) and Amendment 821 to the Federal Sentencing Guidelines (Doc. 61) is DENIED.

DONE, on this the 2nd day of October 2024.

R. AUSTIN HUJJAKER, JR.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE